

CALFED Management Team

**Tuesday, August 27, 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm
Resources Building Room 1142**

Meeting Minutes

Attendance

CALFED Management Team

USBR - Roger Patterson
USFWS - Joel Medlin
EPA - Tom Hagler, Patrick Wright
Corp. of Engineers - Art Champ
CA Resources Agency - Mike Mantell
CA Fish and Game - Greg Zlotnick
DWR - Bob Potter
SWRCB - Tom Howard

CALFED

Lester Snow, Judy Kelly, Sharon Gross, Dick Daniel, Cindy Darling, Mary Scoonover, Michelle wong

Others

Kathy Kelly, Penny Howard, Lynn O'Leary, Pete Chadwick, Karen Schwinn, Marc Lvesebrink, David Cottingham

PW: Suggest adding on the agenda issues to be developed by next meeting.

MS: There are four more signatures to get for the Phase I Letter of Support. Should have all signatures by this Friday and ready for distribution at the press event on September 3.

MK: A press event will be held on Tuesday, September 3, beginning at 10:00 am, on the dock of Delta King River Boat, 1000 Front Street, Old Sacramento. The purpose of the event is to inform the press about the three CALFED Bay-Delta Program alternatives to be analyzed in Phase II. Participants invited to speak include Doug Wheeler, Resources Agency, Bob Perciaseppe, EPA, the BDAC Chair and Vice-Chair.

Lester Snow gave an overview of the Phase II process. He emphasized the need for experts from agencies to be involved in design of the project in addition to regulatory review and comment.

He informed the team that activities by agency staff have been included in the budget. CALFED will have to deal with difficult issues like finance and assurances soon and schedule is tight.

SG: Have begun to identify individuals in resources agencies that can help us.

Category III

Lester announced that Cindy Darling was recently selected for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Habitat Coordinator position.

Cindy Darling provided an update on the activities related to Category III.

MM: Any consideration of possibility that more money may be available?

RP: If additional money is available will a second list be created to fund the projects?

LS: Will go back through a separate process that involve CALFED and the Ecosystem Round Table.

GZ: Who makes the funding decisions on November 1? Some environmental groups have given money to Prop 204, but they want a more comprehensive process than the ad hoc way things had been handled.

LS: Will have category of needs, category of screen diversions, and specific criteria to determine how projects score.

BP: There have been complaints that not enough attention is given to the San Joaquin system. There's a lack of pro-active project sponsors.

CD: The problem is there's no watershed conservancy for the San Joaquin system. First priority is given to ready to go projects.

LS: The Ecosystem Round Table is established under BDAC. It will replace the Steering Committee. The process for decision is the Round Table reports to CALFED and CALFED to the Management Team.

CD: The Round Table will function more like a board and will not meet more than quarterly. Will have its meeting in conjunction with the Management Team?

JM: You'll have the same problem we run into in having an open meeting.

LS:

RP: Need to include agency staff.

CD: Steering Committee will meet for the last time on Sept. 26. The committee can't be dissolved till it knows where the money will go.

RP: How is the Round Table organized?

CD: Will have Ecosystem Round Table operating procedure by next meeting.

LS: Chair of BDAC appoints a chair for the Round Table. There's an overlap of people from the Steering Committee so there should be little down time. Have circulated list of members to the team.

Fish Screens

PC: Need to divide issues into two categories--1) CVP/SWP diversions in the Delta, and 2) on going basis (coordinated set of) screening criteria. Interagency team is in the process of

revising... The team will meet on Sept. 6 again. I'm not involved in the work much. One thing I want you to know is that the team was originally set up to deal with anadromous species, not delta smelt. It's kind of imposing on the team to ask them to deal with issues like delta smelt. Another question is how soon do you need the criteria? Need to work out assurances policy so farmers will be willing to install screens without fear that criteria would change on them.

DC: Need the criteria by Jan. 1.

JM: Ron and Jim are taking lead on anadromous fish. There are different screening needs for anadromous fish and delta smelt. The problem is how to bring these together.

PC: Need criteria that satisfy all species.

BP: If insist on one set of criteria for all species, it may be impossible.

LS: Maybe it's too narrow to use the word criteria.

RP: Need to get it out soon. Criteria are different depending on location.

DD: Lot of Category III and Prop. 204 money would go to fish screens. It's a disincentive now for stakeholders to put in money because of no assurance. The assurances developed by the fish screen team will fit into our program assurances.

GZ: It needs to be not just a process paper but specific criteria.

BP: According to Mike Thabault we should forget about trying to fix screening problem in the Delta.

DD: We should focus on diversion above tidal zone.

RP: There's an immediate need for upstream screen criteria and assurances.

JM: It's too complex to throw everything together. It's easier to break off pieces. Criteria are different for different geographic location.

DD: Priority is to look at screening above tidal zone then feasibility of screens in the Delta. Are looking at focusing on habitat and areas where we can do away with diversions.

LS: Terry Nulls will be the lead person from CALFED to focus on screening needs. Will give clear management signal that this is a priority. Should have standing committee to evaluate on-site. Maybe process could be the outcome and not specific criteria.

RP, LS, DD and others: Priority is to develop criteria for upstream and assurances package by Jan. 1. Would like to have work program. Would be good to have one stop shopping for screening criteria, design, and review.

Baseline Issues

KK: What's purpose of baseline? Is it to be used for long term or a project proposal?

BP: Lowell's paper used the model inappropriately by using it for real time operation. It's attempting to evaluate existing operations by going back to when Accord... It's mixing planning and operation.

LS: Need to resolve differences of 1485, CVRIA, Accord, need to bring in stakeholders. We will coordinate with Lowell to be sure the paper is consistent in separating long term planning and real time operation.

RP & PW, LS & others: Need internal working sessions to get everyone on the same page. Need to deal with both short term and long term. Should get the next iteration by next meeting.

Lowell can work with Mike Thabault, Bruce Herbold & Mike Sterns ?

Phase II Decision Process

MS: The end of Phase II should result in a certification of final EIR/S by the State and a Record of Decision from the federal side. There are some concerns by the regulatory agencies that they are too closely related to CALFED. They don't want to have to compromise individual authority. My answer to that is this is a unique effort and most CALFED agencies have their own responsibilities.

LS: Need to deal with this by next spring. We can't have agencies saying they have problems with the process at the end.

MM, THoward, THagler, AC: This is fundamentally a policy call. Is what integrated resources is all about? Can't dissociate water quality standards and operation criteria. How to maintain balance in mitigating water right proceedings?

MS: 404 permit... not incorporate all authority but individually work toward it.

JM: We can approve project if there's non-jeopardy.

DC: If only one option cause jeopard, the whole doesn't, should be OK.

JM: Not so.

PW: Standards are tricky. Should get inventory of regulatory hoops.

LS: To deal with these resources issues, we need agency help in designing the project, not just review.

Somebody: Must do really good planning. Should look at whole, not just single component. Not every component is critical.

DD: My suggestion is to have a single Section 7 consultation to get biological opinion. Build in assurances to sell program instead of own Section 10 consultation--HCP process.

MS: We will put together write-up on authorities and options for next meeting.

Tom Howard gave update on San Joaquin tributary negotiations.

Penny Howard gave update on Grasslands.

Roger Patterson informed the group that Laura's process white paper on stakeholder involvement will be available next week.